



P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,117	09/22/2003	Kieko Morita	030096A	5419
23850	7590	04/27/2004	EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			JONES, DAMERON LEVEST	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

D. L. Jones

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

## **RESTRICTION INTO GROUPS**

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claim 1, drawn to a method of proving the existence of an alternative glucose pathway, classified in class 424, subclass 9.2.
  - II. Claims 2-10, drawn to a method wherein a radiolabeled compound is injected into a subject and PET is performed, classified in class 424, subclass 9.4.
  - III. Claims 11-14, drawn to a method wherein a radioactive compound is injected and the whole brain is isolated, classified in class 424, subclass 1.81.
  - IV. Claims 15-19, drawn to a method of establishing a diagnostic profile, classified in class 424, subclass 9.4.
  - V. Claims 20-22, drawn to an in vitro method of using a diagnostic profile, classified in class 424, subclass 1.11.
  - VI. Claim 23, drawn to a method of using CSF to diagnose mental disorder, classified in class 424, subclass 9.1.
  - VII. Claims 24 and 25, drawn to a medication for treating mental disorders, classified in class 514, subclass 1.
  - VIII. Claims 26 and 27, drawn to a method of treating mental disorders, classified in class 424, subclass 9.1.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the inventions are different because the method steps of each invention neither anticipate nor render obvious the method steps of another invention. Hence, the inventions are separate and distinct over one another even though some of the invention classify in the same area.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

#### **ELECTION OF SPECIES**

4. Claims 1-27 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising various methods of diagnosing and treating disorders using an alternative glucose pathway. In particular, the methods may be any one of Groups I-VIII above. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to ***elect a single disclosed species***, even though this requirement is traversed.

**Note:** The Examiner respectfully requests that Applicant elect a single species from within the elected group for search purposes. In particular, Applicant is requested to elect a radiolabeled/radioactive compound, if applicable for the elected group.

5. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.


6. A telephone call was not made to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement due to the complexity of the restriction requirement.

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. L. Jones whose telephone number is (571) 272-0617. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 6:45 a.m. - 3:15 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



D. L. Jones  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1616

April 26, 2004